

man, as exemplified in the desires of capitalistic groups in different European countries to extend the ambit of their nations' power in order that within that extended ambit they might have more advantageous conditions under which they could take advantage of business opportunities in uncivilized, semi-civilized or backward nations. The conflicting national aspirations of protectionist European countries, like France, and Italy, and Germany, in Africa and Asia were in no small measure responsible for the war.

I cherish the opinion that if the international gospel preached and practised by the Great Apostles of Free Trade, Cobden and Bright, had been followed by the rest of the civilized world, this war, as far as we humans can dimly see, would not have happened; and I believe that the way of peace in the future lies in the acceptance of the principle that under the economy of Providence, his footstool is so framed and constituted that each part has certain natural advantages peculiar to itself; that its inhabitants likewise are possessed with certain natural or acquired endowments, and that the application of the endowments of each to the peculiar advantages by them possessed and the free interchange of the resultant products will not only bring about the greatest abundance of national wealth, but more important still, by the growth of inter-dependence among all peoples, will remove many of the occasions for war and conduce to the spirit of peace.

The efforts of Cobden and Bright may not have been and were not entirely successful, but let me say this—that these men taught the British people that their great interest was peace. Without peace, where would have been the natural progress of the Victorian age, and without the material progress of the Victorian age, where would have been the money that flowed from British sources to arm and sustain nearly every one of the Allies in the great war.

And as protection has tended to the creation of a bad international spirit, so has it wrought evil and not good within the nation itself. Quite apart from the economic loss which in my view it has entailed on Canada, the degradation to which it has subjected our politics has been more destructive to national righteousness. The Red Parlour has been one of the chief demoralizing factors in our national life. No small part of the campaign funds of the Protectionists in the past has been more or less willingly subscribed by protected interests who had to recoup and who did

recoup themselves from the higher prices, which the retention or the imposition of protective duties on goods similar to those they sold to the public permitted them to do. And apart from this immoral condition there has occurred this great loss to the nation. The manufacturers of this country are among the ablest of our people. Our protectionist principle has practically debarred them from giving to the nation any disinterested advice upon the great question of taxation. If a question as to whether certain tariff rates should or should not be lowered or raised, how can a manufacturer of the articles to be affected, unless he is more than human, consider the question, from purely a national standpoint, and with no regard to what he believes to be his own interest. And this interested viewpoint tends to be more or less unconsciously assumed by the bank which lends him money, the lawyer who advises him, the doctor who attends his family, as well as the bookkeeper and clerks in his office and the work people in his factory.

Harsh you may say, yes harsh but only too true—not that all manufacturers have succumbed to the tendencies of the system—men there are who are alive and sensitive to the public interest, but I take it that these are such in spite of their environment.

The case for freedom in exchange is so overwhelming that we have a right to say that the burden of proof lies upon our protectionist friends, and indeed they appear to have assumed the burden, for during some months past they have filled the press with their protectionist pleas, sometimes frankly enough over the signature of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, sometimes not so frankly over the signature of the Canadian Reconstruction Committee, of which Sir John Willison, paid, I am credibly informed, \$10,000 a year by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, is the moving spirit.

Let us examine the statement and spirit shown by these advertisements. The first of these and, I should judge, the most widespread, is put forward in the form of a question: "Where is the Revenue to come from?" This question in the mouth of a high protectionist is not without the saving grace of humour.

It would appear to most of us who have thought at all about the matter, that the more the tariff approached the protectionist ideal of keeping goods out, the less would it fulfill its functions of a producer of revenue. It does not seem to have struck the pro-

[Mr. McMaster.]